

Remarks

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner:

(1) rejected claims 13 and 14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention;

(2) rejected claims 1, 5-10, 13-17, and 20-32 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. in view of Pellegrino et al.;

(3) rejected claims 2-4, 11, 12, and 18 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. in view of Pellegrino et al., further in view of DeLaHuergera; and

(4) rejected claim 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. in view of Pellegrino et al., further in view of Lee et al.

In response to Item 1 above, Applicant has now presented claim 13 as originally filed so as to replace the language "time limit is 30 seconds" with -- response to said prompting means is required within a time limit --. Applicant submits that the previous presentation of claim 13 incorrectly incorporated the language of claim 14. Claim 13, as originally filed and as now

presented, is believed to provide a more proper antecedent basis for "said time limit". Accordingly, claims 13 and 14 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

In response to Item 2 above, Applicant has now amended independent claims 1 and 32 so as to more clearly define the present invention with respect to the prior art of record.

Amended claim 1 comprises a system for delivering an educational program to a participant at a remote site, the system comprising prompting means for prompting the participant for a response during the educational program, the educational program software at the server computer configured to receive the response so as to verify that the participant actively works through the educational program, the prompting means configured to terminate the educational program when the response to the server is inadequate from the participant, wherein program credit is awarded based on viewing the education program rather than passing specific examinations.

Applicant believes that Cannon et al. discloses an application usage time limiter which monitors application programs opened or otherwise executed on a computer. Applicant

believes that Cannon et al. disclose a continual program use detector 106 contained in an application usage time limiter 100, and that application usage time limiter 100 is itself a program running either as a front end to various selected programs for monitoring, or as a background program running in a time-sharing environment. Applicant has carefully reviewed Cannon et al. and believes that Cannon et al. do not teach or suggest prompting means for prompting a participant for a response during an educational program, educational program software at a server configured to receive the response so as to verify that the participant actively works through an educational program, and the prompting means configured to terminate the educational program when the response to the server is inadequate from the participant.

Applicant believes that Pellegrino et al. disclose a system for delivering an educational program to a participant at a remote site, and a logon page for directing the user to various home pages. Applicant has carefully reviewed Pellegrino et al. and believes that Pellegrino et al. do not teach or suggest prompting means for prompting a participant for a response during an educational program, educational program software at a

server configured to receive the response so as to verify that the participant actively works through the educational program, and the prompting means configured to terminate the educational program when the response to the server is inadequate from the participant.

Applicant believes that neither Cannon et al. nor Pellegrino et al., either alone or in combination with one another, teach or suggest the prompting means of the present invention for prompting a participant for a response during an educational program, educational program software at a server configured to receive the response so as to verify that the participant actively works through the educational program, and the prompting means configured to terminate the education program when the response is inadequate from the participant, wherein program credit is awarded based on viewing the educational program rather than passing specific examinations. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Amended claim 32 comprises a method for delivering an educational program to a participant at a remote site, the method comprising prompting the participant for a response

during the educational program, educational program software at the server configured to receive the response so as to verify that the participant actively works through the educational program, and terminating the educational program when the response to the server is inadequate from the participant, wherein program credit is awarded based on viewing the educational program rather than passing specific examinations. For at least the reasons identified herein above, Applicant believes that neither Cannon et al. nor Pellegrino et al., either alone or in combination with one another, teach or suggest a method for delivering an educational program to a participant at a remote site, the method comprising prompting a participant for a response during an educational program, the educational program software at the server configured to receive the response so as to verify that the participant actively works through the education program, and terminating the educational program when the response to the server is inadequate from the participant, wherein program credit is awarded based on viewing the educational program rather than passing specific examinations. Accordingly, independent claim 32 is believed to

be in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-10, 13-17, and 20-31, which depend either directly or ultimately from independent claim 1, are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the above-identified reasons. Accordingly, allowance of claims 5-10, 13-17, and 20-31 is respectfully requested.

In response to Items 3 and 4 above, DeLaHuerga and Lee et al. have been carefully reviewed, and Applicant believes that none of the prior art of record, either alone or in combination with one another, teach or suggest prompting means for prompting a participant for a response during an educational program, educational program software at the server configured to receive the response so as to verify that the participant actively works through the educational program.

Applicant believes that DeLaHuerga discloses a data collection system for securing, gathering, storing, and accessing information used in a hospital. Applicant has carefully reviewed DeLaHuerga and believes that DeLaHuerga does not teach or suggest prompting means for prompting a participant for a response during an educational program, and educational

software at the server configured to receive the response so as to verify that the participant actively works through an educational program.

Applicant believes that Lee et al. disclose lesson segments presented to a student on a computer in which a student may set a flag as an indication to change or stop the presentation. Applicant has carefully reviewed Lee et al. and believes that Lee et al. do not teach or suggest prompting means for prompting a participant for a response during an educational program, and educational software at the server configured to receive the response so as to verify that the participant actively works through an educational program.

Claims 2-4, 11, 12 and 18, which depend either directly or ultimately from independent claim 1, are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons identified hereinabove. Accordingly, allowance of claims 2-4, 11, 12 and 18 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-32 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested.

- 17 -

In the event that any fees may be required in this matter,
please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 16-0221.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Sheridan 10/20/04

James A. Sheridan

Registration No. 43,114

Pandiscio & Pandiscio

470 Totten Pond Road

Waltham, MA 02451-1914

Tel. (781) 290-0060

EC/FUST1.AMD2